

## REMARKS

### Entry of Amendment

As Applicants are filing a RCE herewith, this amendment should be entered and considered by the Examiner at this time.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's withdrawal of the previous prior art and double patenting rejections. Applicants will now address each of the Examiner's remaining objections and rejections in the order in which they appear in the Final Rejection.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner rejects Claims 1-7, 16-18 and 23-28 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, and under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse these rejections, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claims 1, 2, 23 and 26. It is respectfully submitted that these amendments overcome the §112 rejections.

For example, with regard to the Examiner's objection that independent claims "literally mean that the nozzle is on or in contact with the film", while Applicants disagree, independent Claim 1 has been amended to recite "horizontally moving a first nozzle and a second nozzle, which are integrated, to a first selected portion of the film with a spacing between the integrated first nozzle and second nozzle, and the film." Claims 2, 23 and 26 have been amended in a similar manner. This should clarify that the first and second nozzles are integrated and that the integrated nozzles are

moved to a selected position with a spacing between the integrated nozzles and the film (i.e. the nozzles are not on or in contact with the film).

With regard to the Examiner's objections to the terms "affinity" and "repellant," in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants have deleted these terms from the claims.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the §112 rejections have been overcome, and it is requested that the rejections be withdrawn.

#### Specification

The Examiner also objects to the specification for informalities therein. In particular, the Examiner objects to the terms "affinity" and "repellant" and states that confusion as to these terms affects the clarity of the meaning in the claims. While Applicants disagree with this objection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants have deleted these terms from the claims, which should render this objection moot.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this objection be withdrawn.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112

The Examiner rejects Claim 7 under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are canceling Claim 7, without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering this rejection moot.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

## Conclusion

As the Examiner has stated that the prior art and double patenting rejections have been overcome, and since the §112 rejections and the other objections to this application have been overcome by this amendment, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any further fee should be due for this amendment and/or RCE, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Dated: October 16, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark J. Murphy/  
Mark J. Murphy  
Registration No. 34,225

COOK ALEX LTD.  
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568